

what you want. There is a lot of ground given by the whole lending profession to go along with the two party check, the original Wiley Remmers concept, elimination of the five year statute of limitation, I think down to 18 months, the whole works. If Nebraska were to pass 343 in the form it is now or would be if you adopted the committee amendments without the Remmers amendment, if Nebraska did that, by the admission of both sides and every side to this controversy, you would have the only, the first, the most modern system in the United States for handling this type of thing. It would be the model, and the banks and lending institutions have in fact agreed to put up the financing to get it set up in the next 18 months during which this type of thing would be in existence.

SENATOR KILGARIN: As there are no other lights on, I would now recognize Senator Remmers to close on his amendment.

SENATOR REMMERS: Madam Chairman, members of the Legislature, a few points that I hope you will listen to, pay attention to. The first thing I want to say that my original concept was just exactly what I am proposing now. The security interest holder that went into this amendment that I put into the Journal, I did think it was a compromise and I didn't study it very carefully and I entered it but I had some misgivings about it and I talked to some people about it the next day that I thought perhaps this was wrong. As far as an agreement, Senator Haberman suggests that we had an agreement, I hope that Senator Haberman is not an individual that never changes his mind. I hope that Senator Haberman is a person that can admit that maybe he has erred and I think I erred in accepting that supposed compromise. I am not so sure who really agreed to this compromise. I do believe that Bob Anderson, Coop, probably signed the letter that I do not believe addressed the situation as most of the people that he represented would like to have had. I think he was in error in that and I think most of those people that he works for recognize it and I think he knows it now, and I would hate to think that we ever get in the place that we can't say, "Hey, I was wrong and we ought to do it the other way". Again my first concept was a banking institution, and I realize that banking probably was not covering it sufficiently but I thought perhaps a lending institution would. I do agree that the central filing system probably would be an idea situation, I think a very expensive situation for the buyers of the products, and it will be two years before it gets set up I am sure. I would be very much surprised if we would have a system, if we decided today, that we would have a system set up in two years that could be used over the state. Senator Lamb's point is well taken and it was